

LEVEL
ONE

416
BEXLEY HALL LIBRARY
7150

CANADA and CHRISTENDOM

CANADA and CHRISTENDOM

Vol. 4 No 6 Toronto, Ontario

July 1950

EDITORIAL BOARD

D.F. Belway	Trinity College
K.H.M. Creal	Trinity College
R.F. Stackhouse	Wycliffe College

BUSINESS EDITOR

D.J. Woeller	Trinity College
--------------	-----------------

Contributors This Issue

H. H. Walsh - Professor of Theology in
Montreal Diocesan Theological College

G. S. Burchill -Student in Divinity
in King's College, Halifax, N.S.

EDITORIAL

During the summer months many theological students will be working across the country in various missions and parishes. Their work is necessarily temporary, and most of them do not remain long enough to enjoy the fruits of their labours. They are forced to fulfill a non-sacramental type of ministry, and hence their tasks are primarily those of teaching and visiting. Many a theolog, functioning under these strictures, must yearn for priest's orders, wherein he can share to a fuller degree the corporate and sacramental life of the Body of Christ. Meanwhile our thoughts are devoted to that army of volunteer labourers, many of whom for the first time are confronted with parochial responsibilities, and the duties incumbent upon those in positions of leadership. For thousands of people the advent

of the student in the summer, marks the beginning of the only annual contact which they have with the Church's life and worship. There can be little doubt that one of the paramount jobs of the clergy is to teach the Faith to twentieth century men and women, in twentieth century language in and out of season. We feel sure, however, that many students would greatly appreciate some teaching assistance in the form of pamphlets, short articles in serial form, or even 'comic strips'. There is an alarming dearth of sound theological literature of a sufficiently realistic and practical kind to interest and educate those whose formal education is negligible. Many a student (and parish priest), whose various duties preclude their composing lively little treatises on Biblical and Dogmatic theology, would find any such helps invaluable.

The levels of education, intelligence and eagerness in the average parish are legion, but there exists today a large body of people, whose formal education ended early in life, and who are almost entirely out of touch with the fundamental truths which the church proclaims. What literature there is, is, for the most part, far too scholarly and erudite to be of any real help. Most of these people are 'scared stiff of a page of naked print', but many of them can be induced to read short articles on theological subjects, if not an entire book. There is room here for a person of intelligence, maturity and with a capacity for story telling to exercise his talents in a vital job.

Many criticisms have been levelled at the Church from within and without as a result of a growing consciousness of what might be called 'sociological problems'. We have condemned our increasing suburbanization, we have inveighed against the general bourgeois tone of most of our preaching and teaching. This must be done. At the same time, not nearly enough attention has been paid to a phenomenon which cuts across social and economic divisions, and which has bequeathed to the Church an entire generation religiously illiterate and morally insensitive. The modern product of our much vaunted state schools is just that. Alert educators are well aware of the menace which stalks about in the name of Education. But the simple fact is that a preacher attempting to teach the Catholic Faith can no longer take the baldest truths of Christianity for granted. We must carry on a constant fight against the undisciplined, uncritical and stereotyped kind of mind which the State schools are producing. Meanwhile the Church is

faced with the enormous task of teaching the Faith to a generation whose education has been of this kind. We cannot content ourselves with the intelligentsia, the fastidious or the aesthetic. We have a solemn vocation to evangelize all mankind. It is one of the tasks of our theological colleges to train and educate clergy for this century and for this country. This requires first hand acquaintance with the milieu in which the clergy must work. We have to know what kind of mind the movies, the comic books, the state schools and the urban, capitalist - economic environment are producing. Without this (excluding heroic sanctity) we shall never do more than touch the bare periphery of our society. For too long we have been content to minister to a few pliable old women, while a host was swallowed up in the omnivorous maw of our complex culture. In a large industrial town in central Ontario, in which there are five Anglican churches, the number of persons between the age of fifteen and thirty in regular attendance at the Sunday Eucharist can be counted on fingers and toes. This situation is, happily, not Canada-wide, but the lamentable fact is that it could probably be reproduced more often than not. We have already lost one generation, and the next, in which the tradition of Sunday Church-going will be all the more tenuous is even now clamouring at the world's threshold. Our job is clear and straightforward--to teach and to teach in all places and at all times to every man, in simple, unequivocal language, the content of that Faith which was once for all delivered to the saints.

IMPORTANT BOOKS

The editor of Canada and Christendom has asked me to comment on "what I consider to be the four or five most important books (important, that is, in a general sense - from the point of view of the Church and contemporary society), that have been published in the last year or so." It is necessary to eliminate the word 'important' from this assignment, since it is quite possible that I have not read the most important books that have come off the press on the subject of the Church and contemporary society. There has been such a deluge that no one could hope to read them all.

Nor would I dare claim the omniscience necessary to comment on all the books that are written on the assigned subject. There is, for example, T. S. Eliot's Towards the Definition of Culture. This may be a great book, but until one has mastered the Eliotic idiom it must remain a mystery.

With these reservations I accept the assignment, and venture to select five very important recent books. The first is A. J. Toynbee's Civilization on Trial (New York, Oxford University Press, 1948). The importance of this book stems from the fact that it was written by the author of A Study of History. The sixth volume of that tremendous work concluded as follows: Since there is no salvation through the universal state, what are the prospects through a universal Church? Civilization on Trial is an interim answer to this question, and Toynbee seems to be inclining towards the Church as the only hope of civilization.

One continues to quote Toynbee with some hesitation these days, as the so-called scientific historians are gleefully tearing to shreds those myths and patterns which were supposed to make sense of history. But this was bound to happen, as the patterns were intended to be used with a certain elasticity which infuriates a historian like Pieter Geyl who wants something he can use with scientific precision. However, it would seem that Toynbee is nearer the truth when he says that historians of a scientific bent are annoyed with him because he has brought God into the argument, and has even ventured to say in Civilization on Trial that the 'great new event in the history of mankind is still the Crucifixion and its spiritual consequences.' In a debate over the B. B. C. which is to be found in a little book called The Pattern of the Past by Geyl, Toynbee and Sorokin, Toynbee twits Geyl of accusing him of being a pessimist because he sees no way of escape from disaster except in a reconversion to the faith of our fathers" - like the old lady who was advised to leave it to Providence and exclaimed: 'Oh dear, has it come to that?'

It is perhaps only fair to say that Toynbee has critics from the opposite pole to that of Geyl. Some theologians feel that the myths and patterns he draws so freely from the New Testament are not always myths and that he is subtly dissolving the historic content of the Gospel narratives into a vague mythical story. Be that as it may, I think we must commend him for the very useful patterns he has given us, such as challenge and response which, as one historian has put it, "We can apply almost anywhere in history, though a critic might pick holes in any particular application of the idea in actual life, where all things are so inextricably entangled."

The second book on my list is The Reconstruction of

Humanity by Pitirim A. Sorokin (Boston, The Beacon Press, 1948). As in the case of Toynbee it is the earlier writings of Sorokin that makes this book important. Social and Cultural Dynamics (1937) and Man and Society in Calamity (1943) are such unusual feats of sociological research that one is compelled to give some credance to what Sorokin has to say on the reconstruction of humanity. Again like Toynbee, he has given us some useful patterns, whereby we can decide whether we are moving forward or backward in the never-ceasing quest for the 'kingdom'. It goes without saying that Sorokin likes his own patterns better than Toynbee's and in his criticism of the latter's philosophy of history in the Journal of Modern History (Sept. 1940) he soundly berates Toynbee for his ignorance or neglect of many important sociological works, which would have put a brake on some of the more imaginative patterns. No one would ever dare accuse Sorokin of neglecting any relevant work, sociological or otherwise. But it does seem to be claiming too much when he affirms that A Study of History would be a 'most stimulating and illuminating work' if it were translated into more accurate terms of the real sociocultural systems of the great rhythm of Sensate - Idealistic - Ideational super systems of culture... There may be some truth in this, but one fears that Toynbee's reading public would rapidly diminish if he began translating his books into Sorokin's sociological patterns. It is the mouth filling terms with which the author of The Reconstruction of Humanity has laden his book that keeps it pretty well out of circulation, while Toynbee's is in constant demand. Despite the drawback of style and an amazing egotism, no one can afford to overlook the Harvard sociologist who has made the study of humanity in the face of calamity so much his own, especially in these calamitous days. Without doubt he is a necessary complement to Toynbee, as he himself so painstakingly demonstrates in his review of A Study of History.

Two books on my list may well be considered together. They are Faith and History by Reinhold Niebuhr (New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1949) and Christianity and Civilization, by Emile Brunner (London, Nisbet and Co., 1948). These two carry us far more deeply into the theological situation and are more intensely concerned with the problem of faith. It may be that an Anglican is ill-equipped to pass judgment on Neo-Orthodoxy, since the Anglican Communion has never been involved so dangerously in Neo-Protestantism, as were the traditions from which both

Niebuhr and Brunner hail. Nevertheless, it remains true that many of the insights which it may not be inappropriate to call transcendental shaped the organic development of the Reformed Church of England, and are part of our heritage. It is these insights that both Brunner and Niebuhr are urging upon us as needful in order to understand our present problematic situation.

To Karl Barth belongs the original honour of calling Western Christendom back to a consideration of the foundations of Reformation Christianity, but these foundations have certainly been made more intelligible to the general reader in the writings of Brunner and Niebuhr. Paul Tillich is probably even more helpful, but his significance has already been commented upon by Professor Coleman in the February issue of Canada and Christendom.

It is difficult to pass any final judgment on Brunner's book, since it contains only the first series of the Gifford lectures. What is available at present is devoted to destroying the idols of humanism, which are made responsible for Marx, Nietzsche and the 'totalitarian state in which human personality is practically denied.' Brunner's primary object is to justify his conviction 'that only Christianity is capable of furnishing the basis of a civilization which can rightly be described as human'; he does it, so to speak, by a process of elimination - all other systems have failed.

This negative approach also stands out prominently in Niebuhr's book. The reader is carried on from one false complacency to the next, until history appears as a straight forward march from failure to failure. Nevertheless, there is need of a Niebuhr to startle America out of its complacency, as there is need of a Barth to confound the false prophets of Continental Protestantism. Yet it does not follow that Neo-Orthodoxy has said the last word on the nature and destiny of man. Both our representatives waver badly on the note of Promise to be found in the Bible.

Fortunately the last book on our list - Herbert Butterfield's Christianity and History (London, G. Bell and Sons, 1949) makes ample amends for the short-comings of our theologians. This book has been deliberately reserved for a conclusion to our survey of important books, as it is a good antidote to the gloom that comes over one after a long sojourn with the Neo-Orthodox beyond 'the canons of reason and common sense'.

Under Butterfield's deft touch, history begins to take on intelligible form as we see it 'the business of making personalities, even so to speak, by putting them through the mill.' And this he does without encouraging any undue optimism or self-complacency. History he says will 'fail us if we expect it to hand us happiness on a spoon, ' nevertheless, 'its very vicissitudes bring personality to a finer texture.'

There is nothing very original in this idea, but Butterfield makes no claim to originality. He frankly admits that his interpretation of history comes from the Old Testament prophets with the added insight of the New Testament writings. What is new, is that this book should have been written by a Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge. It is very refreshing to note his positive approach to the 'insoluble and terrifying problems of the present day' by looking at them through the eyes of the prophets who also looked upon equally terrifying problems in their day, and saw the hand of God in history.

Butterfield does not attempt to evade any of the moral ambiguities in history which so disturb our Neo-Orthodox interpreters; like them he agrees that these ambiguities are under the judgment of God, but he firmly balances 'the idea of history as judgment' with 'the idea of history as Promise.'

He also provides us with a 'vision for working purposes in the world' which is based upon the transcendental insights found in both the Old and New Testaments, - to which he adds the wise suggestion that the best way to gain the vision is 'to assume a certain role within the drama itself.' Thus would be stir up the embers of Toynbee's "cold, grey, dead ashes of Christianity."

In thus lauding Butterfield's Christian faith, I am perhaps being unfair to the faith of our previous authors. However, it is difficult to feel that Niebuhr is free from that gnawing skepticism which he finds running through the texture of Christianity in history; Brunner also reveals a lack of confidence in his foundations. Sorokin appears to have great confidence in the ultimate outcome of things, but the road mapped out in such great detail from sensate to ideational is a bit too cyclical. Toynbee's promise is very guardedly hedged about. In Butterfield alone the Promise is

triumphantly proclaimed, since for him the meaning of history lies not in systems and organizations, but 'in each personality as an end in himself.'

H.H. Walsh

Editor's Note:

The Editors of "Canada and Christendom" do not necessarily endorse the views presented in the following essay, but we are pleased to publish a thoughtful article by a divinity student of King's College, Halifax. We feel that student opinion is vitally important, and this article represents a real gain in assisting that community of thought which "Canada and Christendom" Exists to cultivate.

RUINOUS INHERITANCE

"Where standards differ there will be opposition." - Mo-ti.

It was the editorial, REVIVAL OF THE CHURCH, in Canada and Christendom for December 1949, that prompted this article, for all efforts at revival are futile if that revival is to contain within itself the major cause of the original decay.

Alexis Khomyakov, a Russian lay theologian, has an extremely suggestive definition of Anglicanism in his letter of June 6, 1851, to Rev. William Palmer of Oxford, England. He writes:

"The position of Anglicanism is completely defined. It is a narrow ledge of dubious Terra Firma, beaten by the waves of Romanism and Protestantism, and crumbling on both sides into the mighty waters. The position cannot be maintained, but where is the egress? Romanism is an unnatural tyranny; Protestantism is an unprincipled revolt. Neither of them can be accepted. But where is unity without tyranny? Where is freedom without revolt to be found? They are both to be found in the ancient, continuous, unadulterated Tradition of the Church. There a unity is to be found more authoritative than the Vatican, for it is based on the strength of mutual love. There a liberty is to be found more free than

the license of Protestantism, for it is regulated by the humility of mutual love. There is the Rock and the Refuge."

While the nature of unity is a subject providing scope for lengthy study, perhaps no one will raise serious objection to the statement that the most comprehensive unity is a unity in diversity - that transcendent oneness uniting ways of thought and practice. It was this oneness that the Church of England sought to attain in unifying the varied intellectual and theological backgrounds out of which she emerged. Yet, in the record, one is forced to admit that the Church of England has failed in the formulation of such a unity, and succeeded only in bringing these variants together into one place. The resulting spectacle is not pretty. There is the Low Church crumbling into the mighty waters of Protestantism. There is the High Church crumbling into the mighty waters of Romanism. These groups are mutually antagonistic. Between the High and the Low stands the Broad Church which generally represents indifference, but which, if it loves one, loves the Low Church; and, if it hates one, hates the High Church. What has been the cause of this ruinous circumstance -- What has caused the Church of England to fail in her purpose to unify, rather than merely to bring together, the variant elements in her background?

The fundamental error of the Church of England has been her failure to distinguish Catholicism and Evangelicalism from Romanism and Protestantism. This Church has failed to keep clearly in mind the two basic elements that were to be united into a oneness -- into the Church of England. She has brought together Protestantism, Romanism and Indifference into one organization, when her intention was to be neither Roman nor Protestant, but Catholic-Evangelical.

There is a marked tendency to denote by the terms CATHOLIC and EVANGELICAL two basic religious trends. All religion, Christian or otherwise, strives to achieve a close relation of man to his God. From this it follows that the purpose of religion is the direct contact of the individual soul with God. However it is equally obvious that man was intended to be social. Hence his relations to God imply relations with his fellow-men. This, in turn, suggests a religious society in and by which relations with God become possible.

This latter conception - the belief in the necessity of

the Christian society, the importance of orthodoxy, unity, and right government, and its social acts such as the sacraments - was the central one in the Middle Ages. However, in the turmoil of the sixteenth century, there was a trend toward the stressing of the relation of the individual soul to God. Because of this, it has become customary to use CATHOLIC and EVANGELICAL to signify these social and individualistic tendencies respectively. However, an appeal to history indicates that such was not the historic use of these terms. What then is intended by CATHOLIC as apart from Romanism - by EVANGELICALISM as apart from Protestantism?

The term CATHOLIC is derived through $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ from $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ meaning ON THE WHOLE, IN GENERAL, GENERALLY. It was held that the Church as a whole shewed forth the true doctrine, while false doctrine was a local result of part of the Church. As a result of this way of thinking, the term CATHOLIC came to mean "orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, conformity as opposed to dissent". Indeed, so thoroughly was the term applied in this sense, it came to be customary to speak of the CATHOLIC CHURCH in any one place as opposed to the schismatic or heretic groups. As the unity of the Church became more and more asserted, we find an indication of four types of universality as in the CATECHESSES of St. Cyril of Jerusalem: First there is the idea of spacial extension with the implications which Rome has developed to extremes; secondly, completeness of doctrine with the implied exclusion of heretical views; thirdly, adaptation to all kinds of men - neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free; fourth, moral and spiritual perfection - "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father which is in heaven is perfect".

Thus, up to the middle of the fourth century, CATHOLIC was primarily a statement of orthodoxy, and, even when it assumed the broader connotation as in the CATECHESSES, orthodoxy was still an integral part of its meaning.

The word blossomed into a multitude of meanings following the religious upheavals of the sixteenth century. We find that the groups which came to be known as Protestant were not disposed to claim the title and that those who remained under the Papacy, insisted on the doctrine that catholicity could only be retained by communion with the Roman See. For Rome, at least, it followed from this that only Roman Catholics were properly Catholic. Thus this title was expressly opposed to that of Protestant. However, the Church of England, in that it maintained its historic

continuity, claimed the title CATHOLIC and, in theory at least, preserved this term for its own use by applying the term ROMAN CATHOLIC to those under the Papacy. From this point, the history of the word follows three lines - Roman, Anglican and Reformed.

The Church of England contends that a federal government is not a condition of catholicity, pointing out that, in the early church, orthodoxy was maintained by the consistent witness of all parts of the Church. Following on the primitive Church, the Church of England does not apply the term CATHOLIC on the basis of physical extension, but rather on the basis of its ability to minister to all the spiritual needs of all classes of men at all times, and holds that only by maintaining an incorrupt and complete doctrine and worship can this be achieved. The historic Church teaches that this is possible through an historically continuous episcopate which safeguards the Apostolic teaching and is a witness to the consent of all parts of the Church. Here then is an important link between catholicity and the episcopate, the guarantor of orthodoxy. (It was also the episcopate that was to preserve the due administration of the sacraments.) Thus, inferring from the record of the primitive Church, the Church of England holds that any one part of Christendom may properly be designated CATHOLIC if it maintains the faith, the sacraments, and the apostolic ministry. Just as the objective realities of the unity and holiness of the Church are not yet perfect, so is the catholicity of the Church an objective reality, even although still imperfect.

The groups that had their birth pangs in the eruption of the sixteenth century apply the term CATHOLIC to the church of Rome and, in the creed, use the term in the sense of an ideal to be attained.

It becomes evident then that the word CATHOLIC was not historically restricted to the social nature of the church, but rather was a term applied to the Church apart from its inherent connotation.

Now let us examine the term EVANGELICAL to discern its original meaning and present use. It arises in the Greek *ευαγγελιον* - the reward given to the bearer of good tidings. In this sense it is not uncommon in the Odyssey. Under Christian usage, it came to mean, not the reward, but the glad tidings themselves - hence the Gospel. Next it will be noticed that the Gospel was preached by Christ's followers

with a zeal that bore witness to the working of the Holy Spirit and with an efficiency that shewed fruits in the conversion of individual souls to a belief in Jesus Christ. Out of this grows the idea of the Ministry of the Word that was so emphasized in the Evangelical Revival, beginning in the latter part of the Eighteenth Century. It is a logical result of this outlook that individual concerns, other than spiritual, should be attended to. Thus under Wilberforce, Evangelicalism reached the flood-tide of active beneficence. These men believed, and showed that belief in their acts. They took for their maxim that he to whom the good news had come was obliged to impart it to others as well as he could. They set out to spread the Gospel by personal testimony and by such corporate action as the visiting of the poor and the sick, the instruction of the unlearned, and the establishment of schools and colleges. Behind these efforts was a sincere sense of their own responsibility as well as a knowledge of the condition of those whom they sought to convert and aid. Thus it becomes apparent that this movement, directed to the individual soul, embraced the alleviation of every form of human misery.

Out of all this, several things become evident. First, in the primitive Church, the term CATHOLIC was applied to the Church to designate orthodoxy. However, the same term now commonly signifies one emphasis of the Church - the social, sacramental, High Church tendency. Second, the evangelical emphasis was included under the term CATHOLIC in the primitive Church and it was not until the sixteenth century that it became stressed to the point of divorcing it from the social, sacramental emphasis. It was at this time that the term PROTESTANT appeared as a blanket-designation for all those newly formed evangelical bodies.

The Church of England sought to REunite in herself the catholic (in the present sense of the term) and the evangelical emphasis of Christianity under the name CATHOLIC (as used in the primitive Church). In this, as I pointed out above, she has so far failed, in that she has rather brought together Romanism and Protestantism into one place.

Now obviously, if such a reunion of emphasis is to be achieved, it is imperative that we dispense with the old terms in that, for each group, the name of the other has implications leaving a wry taste in the mouth, and also, as I pointed out, there is a multiplicity of terms meaning the same thing and more than one thing. Where shall we turn? What shall we call our catholic-evangelical theology? It

has been suggested to me that I follow that deplorable tendency of our age and compound a new word with the aid of the ubiquitous "Liddell & Scott". Even this, however, is not as easy as it at first sight appears. For the term must be one that means something; that will stand the stress of generations; that has no one-sided implications; that cannot be adopted by the extremists of either the two factions. Keeping these criteria in view, it has been suggested to me, and I adopt it here, that we could do no better than to designate this catholic-evangelical theology by the term CHRISTO-CENTRIC. Here then is a name that means something - a theology based on the undivided Christ; it will stand the stress of time just so long as Christianity itself does; it has no one-sided implications, for who shall say that Christ was Evangelical or a Catholic or a High Churchman or a Low Churchman? Surely He shewed in His life that which a catholic-evangelical theology seeks to exemplify. Yet it is not enough that one should advocate a Christo-centric theology without at the same time indicating, at least, a method of its achievement -- without indicating the source from which such theology must arise.

The record suggests that the division of the catholic and evangelical emphasis has risen in the sincere efforts of men to amend that which they thought to be lacking in their time. However, in their zeal, they developed one of the emphases to the neglect of the other and, as the process continued, the Christo-centric theology became obscured and the problem seemed to become one of "either/or", with the choice lying between the catholic and evangelical emphasis. Indeed, the question rises, and we shall later be forced to discuss whether the Western mind is an "either/or" mind. However, we will assume for the present that it is perfectly capable of the proposed synthesis.

The laity cannot be directly charged with the responsibility of reinstating the Christo-centric theology, for, in general, their theology is the result of their church teaching. Usually those who are brought up in a church of one emphasis, will accept and adhere to its teaching, only becoming negatively aware of the other emphasis. Those few who actually choose their churchmanship do so on a basis, not of authority, but of personal inclination. While there may be a good deal to the view that it is the duty of those seeking to re-propagate the Christo-centric theology to bring before the laity, through printed matter, etc., their responsibility in demanding such a theology, I really doubt if the record will show this to

have been the most effective means. Nor, I think, can the contemporary clergy be directly charged with this duty, for my remarks concerning the churchmanship of the laity largely apply here at the present time. However, a sincere and clearly enunciated appeal for a Christo-centric theology could be very effective among our clergy. But, when the record is written, I feel sure that it will be the contribution of the universities that will stand out. Never can there be a reinstatement of the Christo-centric theology if the Church continues to educate priests in either the catholic or evangelical emphasis. The method of achieving our goal is TEACHING. Before the universities, as before all Anglicans, must be placed this challenge - DO YOU LOVE THE PARTIAL CHRIST MORE THAN THE WHOLE CHRIST? None who truly love Jesus Christ will be guilty of declaring his Word more important than his Body or vice versa.

It still remains to be seen what is to be effected by a Christo-centric theology. St. Paul asked that "--all things be done decently and in order". It is argued that the strength of the Church of England lies in its allowing diverse traditions to flourish simultaneously without the repressive interference of authority. However, I do not hold that this condition makes either for decency and order or for strength. It is the merit of Christianity, not only that its adherents have always known that their's was the one, true faith, but also that this conviction is attended by a desire to share that belief with those who are not Christians.

There is in human nature a desire to share all that one knows to be best. However, this perfectly valid desire causes an unpleasant scene when two persons each believe their own way to be best, and each seeks to share his way with the other. So it is in dividing the work of Christ - the evangelical believes that his theology is the best (else he could not hold it); the catholic believes that his is the best, and even where there is no active attempt to share with the other, still the very existence of each implies the inferiority of the other and precludes the possibility of a united Anglican outlook. As to strength, it is readily apparent, not only that the Christo-centric outlook strengthens the Church, but also that it strengthens each of the two aspects of Christ's work. Thus, rather than have one Catholic and one Evangelical (and not always in accord with one another), we should have two Catholic-evangelicals - thus having two men doing each phase of Christ's work and uniting the two phases into a single Christo-centric

endeavour.

Speaking in extremes, our synthesis would mean that the Catholic would come to see that the Body of Christ is made up of individuals and would direct his efforts to conversion by the Ministry of the Word and then to welding the converted individuals into the sacramental Body of Christ; that the Evangelical would come to see that it is not enough that men should be converted by the Ministry of the Word, and would direct his efforts to the sustaining of these individuals by bringing them into the sacramental life of the church.

The Christo-centric outlook would also affect the Divine Liturgy, for, in placing equal stress on the Ministry of the Word and the Ministry of the Sacraments, we should naturally seek to unite these in our worship as closely as possible and preferably in such a manner as will best symbolize the true progress of the Christian life from individual conversion by the Word to sacramental union in the Body of Christ. Happily The Order For The Administration Of The Lord's Supper Or Holy Communion affords the means of such union. Here we find the Decalogue, the Epistle, the Gospel, the Creed, the sermon, the scriptural Offertory Sentences, the Comfortable Words, and the historic narrative of the Prayer of Consecration, followed by the sacramental union of the worshipper with the Body of Christ. This then, would come to be the primary service of the day and Morning and Evening Prayer would once again fall into their proper place as services purely of penitence, praise, and supplication.

It has been specifically suggested that I indicate the bearing of a Christo-centric theology on such diverse problems as marriage and divorce, and housing. Obviously it is beyond the scope of this article to lay down, point for point, the answer of a Christo-centric theology to such problems as these. Rather must I limit myself to indicating the direction such an answer would take under such influence. I feel that the fundamental result would be that the Church of England would, at least, be able to present a united front in the solution of the problems. In the synthesis, the Evangelical would drop the Contract Theory of Marriage in the face of the reality of the sacraments, thus allowing the whole Church to base her solution on the view that Holy Matrimony is a sacrament and on the resulting implications. On the other hand, the attitude of the Church to such problems as housing would

experience a new effectiveness in that the Catholic would, in the synthesis, acquire the implication of the Evangelical attitude which include the ministering to all the miseries that beset mankind.

Now, I turn to the effects of the Christo-centric theology on a question that has recently become prominent. I refer to inter-communion. In this regard, I am not thinking of inter-communion with the Protestant churches, for such a relationship would (unless the Protestants were willing to accept a full and absolutely Christo-centric theology) serve only to further the over-emphasis of one part of an already divided Christ. I quote from THE RELIGION OF RUSSIA, by Rev. G. B. H. Bishop, Vicar of Cardington, Shropshire, England, in 1915:

"Protestantism, by which is understood excessive individualism in religion, the denial of the teaching office of the Church, and the depreciation or rejection of the Sacraments, is regarded --- as a mutilated form of Christianity which cannot be justified either from Holy Scripture or from the practice of the early Church. It is a complete novelty devised at the Reformation, and the Roman Church is reproached for causing it by her extravagant claims and mediaeval corruptions."

Nor do I look to inter-communion with Rome, corrupted as it is by such doctrines as Papal Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady, the Treasury of Merit, Indulgences, and the penal sufferings of the Holy Souls in Purgatory. Yet I have not exhausted the alternatives, for there remains that great section of Christendom known collectively as EASTERN ORTHODOXY. Here is a group of churches that has hardly changed since the opening centuries of the Christian era - a Church that has always been more evangelistic than the most evangelistic bodies of our Western world; more catholic than the most catholic bodies of our Western world. Here then is a section of Christendom that is truly Christo-centric and yet, like our own church, it consists of a group of national churches. The Church of England has already gone a long way in arranging for inter-communion with the Eastern Church. Surely the Church of England in Canada would be unwise, to say the very least, to forsake the opportunity to continue in this inter-communion with a section of Christendom (numbering 144,000,000 souls) that worships Christ in the

Word and the Body for the sake of inter-communion with the United Church of Canada (numbering 2,200,000 souls) that worships Christ in the Word only.

With regard to inter-communion, I should like again to quote at length from Rev. G.B.H. Bishop:

"We have to admit that the greatest obstacle to inter-communion is our own unsatisfactory condition. This can best be illustrated by the following extract taken from a letter which I (Rev. Bishop) received in 1912 from a Greek archpriest. He writes: 'Unfortunately it is not the question of Anglican Orders that separates us, my friend. This could be settled easily. It is the need of unity in your own faith.' ((-- as others see us!)) The Anglican Church is proud of being comprehensive - like Noah's Ark. In it every colour of belief can be found. Still, all these colours and subdivisions are sheltered under the name ANGLICAN CHURCH; BUT THE TRUTH IS ONE. The Anglican Church has ... to bring her parties into agreement, and be united in herself..."

"Some of us would do well seriously to consider these words ... THE GREAT OBSTACLE TO REUNION IS THAT INDISCRIMINATE COMPREHENSIVENESS SO OFTEN PROCLAIMED TO BE THE GLORY OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION...No doubt there is a reasonable comprehensiveness, but we do not possess it A house divided against itself cannot stand, and a society which cannot issue a clear statement of its principles has no justification for its existence. When the Church of England has decided what she stands for, she will be in a better position to mediate in a divided Christendom."

From this will be seen the urgency of this plea for a Christo-centric theology in the Church of England - a theology that would allow the Church to say, "I am thus", rather than, "I am thus or thus".

We have seen that in the East the undivided Christ is worshipped, while the tendency in our West has been to divide Christ and worship Him either in the Word or in the Body. We are forced then, to ask ourselves if there is an Eastern and a Western mind - a synthetic and an "either/or" mind, and if so, can they be resolved? It is readily apparent to the observer that there exists what might be called an Eastern and a Western mind - indeed this is the

"idea voiced by Kipling:

East is East and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet.

Yet it is not so readily apparent that this difference is exhaustive. Without analysing the problem at length, I suggest that this situation is the result of a variation in epistemological approach. The Easterner tends to intuit and to contemplate things in their aesthetic immediacy, while the Westerner seeks out the theoretically known component. As a result of these tendencies, each states that knowledge other than its own is just no thing at all. Hence, while the Easterner knows things as they are, we of the West concentrate on what we consider to be the essential feature - but two observers may not choose the same feature as essential - hence, in Western Christianity, the divided Christ. Did Christ, then, intend that we in the West should be either Christians of the Word or of the Body?

"...the people pressed upon Him to hear the word of God ..and He...taught the people out of the ship."

"And (Jesus) answered and said unto them, My mother and My brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it."

"..(Jesus) said ... blessed are they that hear the word of God, and Keep it."

Here, as elsewhere, the Scriptures speak of the Ministry of the Word - and it will be noted that these passages suggest a universal obligation on the part of men to receive the Word - there is no suggestion that it is reserved for some.

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me."

"And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath

eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

Here again we must notice that Christ enjoins a sacramental membership in His Body not upon some, but upon all.

All this suggests that Christ intended not only those of the East, but also us of the West to worship Him in the unity of His work -- that ours be a truly Christo-centric theology -- "... (He) hath broken down the middle wall... that He might reconcile both (i.e. those of the Circumcision and of the Uncircumcision) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them which were nigh."

Today, if never before, those who truly love Christ stand forth for all to see -- they are possessed of that CHRISTIAN CHARITY which unites man to man and men to the Blessed Saviour --

They believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in the whole body of the Church, guiding it AS A UNITED WHOLE into truth. Hence their appeal to the witness of the early UNDIVIDED Church in defence of their tenets.

-- they worship the UNDIVIDED Christ -- theirs truly is a Christo-centric theology.

It is the achievement of unity through a Christo-centric theology that the Church of England must now undertake if her final record is not to read as a mere series of revivals and declines brought about by a crippling diversity that precludes all but transitory triumphs over Secularism and Materialism.

"Give me but one firm spot on which to stand, and I will move the earth."- Archimedes.

